

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,549	01/27/2004	Max Arthur Lembke	6579-0068-1	1639
75	90 02/13/2006		EXAMINER	
Richard R Michaud			MICHALSKI, SEAN M	
The Michaud-D	uffy Group LLP			
306 Industrial Park Road Suite 206			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Middletown, CT 06457			3725	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/765,549	LEMBKE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sean M. Michalski	3725	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period value and the reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. tely filed the mailing date of this communicatio (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 Ja	nuary 2004.		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar			s
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	i3 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> are subject to restriction and/or expressions.	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	•		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•		,d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		
2) Notice of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F10-946) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		ratent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/765,549 Page 2

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1 17, are drawn to a razor platform, classified in class 30, subclass 50.
- Claims 18-27 are drawn to a razor cartridge classified in class 30, subclass 54.
- III. Claims 28 30, are drawn to a method for loading razor blades, classified in class 76, subclass 1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because I does not require "a first cover defining an opening". The subcombination has separate utility such as a different razor configuration.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/765,549

Art Unit: 3724

- 3. Inventions III and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed could be made by a process other than the claimed process, such as the process not requiring the steps of "providing a blade support defining at least two mating surfaces positioned to be approximately coincident with said support surfaces defined by said blade platform when said blade platform and said blade support are moved into proximity with one another, said blade support including means for releasably retaining at least two razor blades" as disclosed in group III. The blades could simply be inserted manually.
- 4. Inventions III and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed could be made by a process other than the claimed process, such as the process not requiring the steps of "providing a blade support defining at least two mating surfaces positioned to be approximately coincident with said support surfaces defined by said blade platform when said blade platform and said blade support are moved into proximity with one another, said blade support including means for releasably retaining at least two razor blades" as disclosed in group III. The blades could simply be inserted manually.

Application/Control Number: 10/765,549

Art Unit: 3724

5. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: the embodiment shown in Figure 1, and the embodiment shown in Figure 3.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently claim 1 is generic.

- Species 1 is shown in Figure 1
- Species 2 is shown in Figure 3
- Species 3 is shown in Figure 10
- Species 4 is shown in Figure 11

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record

Application/Control Number: 10/765,549 Page 5

Art Unit: 3724

showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean M. Michalski whose telephone number is 571-272-6752. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM - 4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on 571-272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

smm

DERRIS H. BANKS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700